G. R. S. IX-5]

Previous references.

1927-26

(M 52)

File No 369 19

Serial Nos 1 — 6

Later references.

69-19 15 19

[illegible])

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1 — 6

Part B for Sept. 1927

SUBJECT.

Sanatorium at Darjeeling

G.O.N. 15-19-20 / Mar 369-19-6 & 20.9.27

Stating that the Mar. Deptt. Cannot interfere in the matter &c

---

WD 1888—GPB—16,826—23-7-21

G. R. S. III-1]

1918.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT

(Inwards)

NOTES.

File No. 359-9

FILE HEADING.

Sri Raghavendra Swami matt at Chikpet, Bangalore containing the temple of Sri Anjaneya Devaru and Pandharinath Sri Raghavendra Swamy,

From

Harigachar, Agent of the matt.

— No. Petition Dated 22-12-18 Received 23-12-18

Diary No. 1186] Enclos. — Spare Copies — [Serial No. 1

BRIEF ABSTRACT OF LETTER.

Complains that one Anantaraju has mortgaged the said building and planning measures to subject the property to additional mortgages, and prays for

NOTES AND ORDERS.

its resumption and restoration to Sri Raghavendra Swami matt

1) A. off. calling for report with records, is submitted for appl.

MM 23.12.18 Sd 23/12/18

NOTES—First Sheet.

806

G R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat. | Imp File No. 369 of 1919.

Serial No.

2 I don't think this is a matter in which the Naval Dept may interfere —.
It is open to the matter to proceed against the Ananta Murti in a competent Court of Law.

Asst
23/12/19
Secy)

Director 26/12/19

2. Do. by. Comm. B'bay.
No. 1528 dy. 3. 1. 20.
Forwards the advn. for early ext. with records.

3 Noted, vide by Comm. Bengalore District, letter no 565 Dy 14 12 20
Submits the entire record together with a memo of facts.

D

5. Vide in case of Criminal trials from Mil. Dy Comm. Superintendent of Police, Bangalore City
6 Shows letter sent to Bangalore Station for information

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

G. R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat. | Muz File No. 7869 of 1919.

Serial No.

is endorsed with an annual cash grant of Rs 27-11-0 [illegible] to land inam in the [illegible] Bangalore Taluk.

3) Applications [illegible] extracts [illegible] [illegible]

Submitted
8.1-21
8/1/21

[illegible] 11-1-21

Issued
[illegible]
11/1/21

[illegible] 11-1-21

4 To, Inam Supdt in Mysore
No 2921 Dt 19 1 21
Requests to forward copies of the Inam [illegible] of the [illegible]

5 From, the Inam Supdt in Mysore.
Letter no 209 Dt 18.2.1921.
Submits copies of the Inam registers pertaining to the cash grants and inam lands of Anjaneya Swami temple in the Sumatendra Matt.

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

G. R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat. | File No. 389 of 19 18

Serial No.

✓ (Q.) The case granted by the
land for 10-6 0 we note as a
Devadaya for the upkeep of
Sunatendra Rajaneya in the Sri
Raghavendra Swami Matt in the
Chikpet of Bangalore. In Col. 5,
it is mentioned that the Mirasi for
1799–1800 granted the sum of 12
pagodas a year to Hanumantha
Devaru founded by Raghavendra
Swami. If decided, this Mirasi will
be called for from the Commissioner.

(A) As regards the land value, it is
seen from the exemption that
the land was granted
the benefit of a temple which
came to ruin, but that it was
continued to the temple free of
Tax so long as the object of the
grant was duly fulfilled.

D (C) The Inam records from the
Dy. Com^r soon, fully into the
facts of the case.

(D) May the case be posted
for hearing along with other cases
from the Taluk.

W (E) Even a postcard from the Taluk

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

G R. S. III-2)

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Muz File No. 369 of 19 49

Serial No.	
	Hanyachan praying for an early disposal of the matter, the II & members of Council has been pleased to direct that the Subversion of the papers may be expedited before the meeting.
	22.2.49
	24/2/49
	of the Hindu Law Former Swami Adhikar of Ananthya Murthi And if the present Swami wants to revoke Appointment of Adoption Murthi is the interference of the Court deem justified? 24/2/49
	Issued. Put up the order in Gaz & Ref Comp parts the documents referred in the letter 22/4/49 25/4/49
	Intn. to parties for production of documents are sent.

Submitr. in person obtained orders

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

1748 6

G. R. S. III-2

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Thuc File No. 369 of 19 21

Serial No.

Previous file of 1908 is being traced, and will be submitted

AV 23.4.21 RG 23/4/21

Under the instructions of the Revenue Secretary the case is adjourned to the forenoon of 14th May 21 (Saturday) with the direction that the Collector of Tanjore do attend on that date

RG 19 52

19 issue RG 23/4/21

14 May 21

16. Mr Hariachar appears for the ~~Appellant~~ Petitioner and produces some documents with a memo.

19. Mr Sitaramiya, advocate appears for Jagannatha Murti and applies for a fortnight's time to produce his documents to

Adjd to 4 June 21 RG

20. The 4th June 1921 is likely to be a holiday on account of His Majesty the King Emperor's Birthday which adjournment falls on 3d June is said to have been postponed to 4th idem. Perhaps they may be asked to appear on the 5th June 21 (Saturday) or another day, if applied for to the Registrar of this Court

RG 22 AV 16/5/21

16/5/21

NOTE—Contn. sheet

AV will issue notices on the witnesses

G. R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

(7

Agy File No.

of 19

Serial No

23 The Head agent Hanumachar has given us the papers he wishes us. Rajah Rathna & the other Party Counsel must be instrd. asking him to produce his papers on Saturday the 11th June 21.

RG

17/5/21

The Ag Head Assistant do not be present on 11 June. The Agent may be asked to produce his documents on 6 June.

17/5/21

Date (Memo) (4th Monday) RA

Done

[illegible] Rajagopalachar [illegible] of the [illegible] Raghavendraswami Mutt for [illegible] the following [illegible] his contention that [illegible] Parthasarathyswami Temple [illegible] buildings belong to the [illegible] Anantanumti Rao [illegible] of the temple -

1) Two Inam Title deeds allowing cash grant of Rs 2)-14-0 to [illegible]

NOTE—Contn. sheet

G. R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Mis. File No. 369 of 1914

Serial No

Anjaneyaswami Temple.

2) Extracts from the Inam Register

3) Copy of petn presented by Anantanarasachar & several others protesting against the procession of the Swamy of the Mutt in front of the Mutt at Chikkpet and copy of statement ~~filed~~ made by Anantanarasachar in this connection.

4) Copy of notice given to Anantanarasachar by the Swami of the Sri Raghavendra Swami Mutt directing him to apologize for his ~~action~~ unauthorized action and to hand over the possession of the temple & Mutt to the Mutt agent Hariyachar.

5) Copy of G.O. No. 2234-6/D 3-3-14 rejecting the review petn of Ramacharya of Melbagal in the matter of the resumption and restoration of certain inam lands in Chikkanarase village, Kunigal Sub-Taluk, to the Sri Raghavendra Swami Mutt.

6) Copies of Virup given by the Mutt to one Bhimacharya and of Rangasa given to one Srinivasa

matter of cattle

Nat.

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

(9

G. R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Miz File No. 369 of 19

Serial No

7) nine other documents which support his contention and to be found in the records sent up by the Taluk office.

8) Sri Anantharamurti has presented 8 documents in support of his contention that ~~he is~~ the temple of Anjaneyaswamy & Brindavan at Chikpet, founded by his ancestors, belong to him & that his family is undisturbed possession & enjoyment of them for more than 100 years & that the Matt at Nanjangud has no right to it. The description of the documents is given in the facing sheet of the documents presented by him.

9) Reference is invited to paras 12 to 14 of the Order. [illegible]

10) [illegible] Chikpet, with [illegible] the [illegible] Copy of this is X [illegible] dated [illegible] to which [illegible] in pursuance of the order X.

XEX T1

XU

This Appellate Court by 29.10.1914

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

Serial No.

30 [illegible] Temple, in Rajin entrance [illegible] for [illegible] constructed, and a house [illegible] for [illegible] to be erected in Kodaga Road in front of the [illegible] and [illegible] the main entrance of the temple [illegible] He visited the house with four [illegible] and [illegible] in which [illegible] Shanmuga Bhatta and Ramaiah the former to Anjaneya Shanmuga Bhatta and Ramaiah the writer. The owners of the two dilapidated houses having visited Bangalore and [illegible] with the [illegible] or other matters [illegible] writer (viz the immediate [illegible] Gopalachar) ordered to the Anjaneya shall be called by a strong [illegible] the Rajamahal Road [illegible] and requested the owner to [illegible] depositions of the writer, and [illegible] upon the Honorable [illegible] the matter, the writer and the temple were handed over to Ramanjaneya possessions.

He secures Rs cash grants of Rs 7-8-0 and of 20-6-0 Total 27-14-0 for the temple of Sri Anjaneya at Chickpet

31 On the death of Sri Ramanjaneya

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

G. R. S. III-21

General and Revenue Secretariat. | III L File No. 2, 6 of 19 .

Serial No.

the Majority of the Sowcars there being
two, taken advantage of by one Srinivasa
Varachar who secured the writings
and the temple and enjoyed them
for a while But on the attainment
of Majority, Arumugam applied
to the Adawlat Court for possession
of the writings and the temple
which had been in wrongful
possession of Srinivasachar and
secured an order from that Court
that Arumugachar should be put in
possession of the Sowcar & the temple.
~~Upon this order being sent to the~~
~~Collector~~ the Adawlat Court ordered as per
the 2nd Oct. 1811.
~~the Collector to send the writings~~
~~upon this order being sent to the~~
23 day of
~~Collector~~ referred to
Samudram Srinivasachar's case in clause
Above set forth and Proceeded in the
the following words —

"The two writings have been
released from the possession of
Srinivasa Varachar and put in the
possession of Arumugachar &c.

b Arulalan Venkata Subbiah for possession of the properties and secured a Samand Dated the 3d day of Ashada Ashadha Bahula of the Saka year corresponding to 30th June 1809 & the effect that the properties should be restored to Arumugachar. As Srinivasachar still gave trouble Arumugachar applied

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

G. R. S. III-21

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Mw2 File No. 369 of 19[illegible]

Serial No.

Also details the circumstances of the grant goes into the merits of the case and directs that the properties should be restored to Arcaula Thar and that nobody else had anything to do with them

Ramachandra Mall, who showed "perform worship in the Rukmini "Pancha Parama temple, Veeta Ram "and Vyapi (the claimants) heritable "succession". The Adawlat Court order

37 Thus Ramachandra the son of Konerachar has been in possession of the Ram and temple since 1811, So that the writer says the temple & the property have been in the possession of Konerachar & his family descendants for over 150 years.

35 The following genealogical table will be explained in the further hearing

1. Konerachar
2. Anandachar
3. Vankatesh [illegible]
4. Sonavva, wife of Venkatesh Bhat
5. Rangabhatta [illegible] Bhat Kulkarni
6. [illegible]

The names of persons in the figures in this hearing are all in order in the writ. We have done with all the

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

institution might not be disturbed to him. A detailed report was called for in this office letter no 4124 G 19.3.08. The matter was enquired into in detail then and the Amildar reported that Puja and other services were being regularly conducted, that the income of the temple were not misappropriated as had been represented by the Mutt agent, and that there was no reason for withholding pay of the Carnatic Tasdik. The Dep: Com: agreed with the views of the Amildar. No further action was taken in the matter. Mr. A. Subramanya Iyer had a talk with the Swamigal who said that a compromise had been arranged and so the matter was dropped and the Vernacular papers were all ret. to the Dep: Com: - (Vide notes in Mur file no 49 of 08.).

30 The same agent Krishnachar agitated the matter again in October 1910 and the notes in Mur file 231-10 show that Even then a doubt was entertained Whether the Mutt had anything to do with the Sannadhi Inam in any of Bangalore at all. As

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

G. R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Mur File No. 369 of 191 /

15

Serial No.

D

† Vide G.O.Nº. 6-22-33
Mur 237-12-4
3. 1. 11. 12

Answers

Yes. It is Devadaya, but not made out in the name of the Raghavendra Swami Matt. It is to be enjoyed by the Manager Pro Tem. & is actually in the enjoyment of the Archaks. (Kinsmen & his descendants)

There are no records to show that the Matt ever managed the temple affairs or the Inams. The presumption is not therefore correct.

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

deposed. His agent Krishnachar who also happened to be the brother of the previous Swamiji subsequently became the Swamiji of the Sri Raghavendra Swami Matt at Manjangud and has now left the present agent Hanumachar to continue the agitation.

37 The Deputy Commr, Bangalore Dt. who has admitted the contention of the Matt agent adduces the following reasons in favour of his opinion:-

(1) The institution is a purely Mutt Endowment being a temple for the support of which an annual grant in perpetuity is made from public revenues in addition to land inam granted & recognised & registered as the Inam settlement as a Devadaya.

(2) It is no doubt under the control of the Matt Authorities who have been managing the affairs thereof ever since its existence.

(3) It is amply borne out by the records that such recognised Manager is none other than the presiding Swamiji of the Sri Raghavendra or Raja Matt.

G. R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 867 of 1917

Serial No.

16

Answers.

The opponent & his ancestors were as per note above not the Mutt nominees but got possession of the building & properties in virtue of a sanad issued by the then Amildar in accordance with the decision of the Adawlat Court enjoying the same in hereditary succession.

The institution is said to be maintained in proper condition & so there is no reason for moving him.

How his ancestors got the properties has been described in the above notes.

This has been the copy of the agent of the Ramjangat mutt in reason but by reason, but has not been borne out by the records of the local officers.

NOTE—Contn. sheet

(4) The opponent who is only a pujari and a nominee of the mutt having no locus standi in the internal management of the affairs of the temple and its adjuncts is incompetent to establish his private rights over the institution & to alienate portions of the same & with his own hands. Failure & keep up the institution in proper condition would lead to the displacement of the managers themselves, and here the opponent happens & be a mere servant or pujari of the temple liable & be ousted at any time

(6) The opponent has adduced no documentary evidence & showing (1) the property belongs to his ancestors & whom he or his ancestors got into the ownership of the institution.

(7) The petitioner complains that there has been gross & persistent mismanagement of the institution & its property & & breach of trust & prays that he may be removed & the properties given over & [illegible]

R. S. III 2]

General and Revenue Secretariat. | 11/12 File No. 369 of 1912

Serial No. 38

In the closing lines of his report the Judge himself says that "the Petitioner, however, has not produced evidence of instances in which he or his Master (the Swamis of the Raghavendra Matt at Nanjangud) exercised authority over the institution". This conclusive evidence shows that the Raghavendraswami Matt has no manner of control or authority over the Bangalore Chikpet Sri Venkataramana Swami Devasthanam.

39 The agent of the Sri Raghavendra Swami Matt has produced a copy G.O No. 2234-6/678-08-8 dated the 3rd March 1911 on which he relies. This directed that certain inam lands in Chickmanse village of the Kunigal Sub Taluk endowed by the Sri Ramachandra Devaru of the Sri Raghavendra Swami Matt at Nanjangud should be enjoyment of a third party which was in the prior should be resumed from the party and restored to the Matt. This order does not apply to the case now in

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

G. R. S. III-2.

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 369 of 191

Serial No

10.

The inam in the case of the Bangalore Chikpet Sunnatudda Matt anjaneya devaru is no doubt a devadaya, but has been granted not to the swami of the Sri Raghavendra Swami Matt at Kanjanagud but to the anjaneya devaru in the Bangalore Chikpet Matt. The two grants have nothing in common. The other papers produced by the Matt agent are mere copies of title deeds and entries raised by the opponent and do not prove the claim of the Matt over the Bangalore building.

X 2

(3) The papers produced by the opponent Ananta Murti are, besides the sale deed executed in favor of his father by Venkubai in 1903 and the genealogical table, mainly receipts for payment of taxes for the Chikpet building showing that he and his ancestors have been in undisturbed possession of the temple & building for long.

X 1

(4) The inam register extracts furnished from the Inam Supdt confirming a cash grant of Rs 27-14-0 and a Kodige inam

NOTE—Contn sheet

G. R. S. III-2,

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Mdr File No. 307 of 191 C/10

19

Serial No

favour of the Anjaneya Devasthanam at Chik-pet do not mention the Sri Raghavendra Swami Matt at Vanjangadu as the manager of the Devasthanam, but certain persons to be in enjoyment thereof so long as the Service for which the grants were made was satisfactorily performed. The Sri Raghavendra Swami Matt has, as the Deputy Commr has reported, never exercised any control over the Bangalore Matt building. It has not contributed anything for the maintenance of the Services in the temple, nor is there anything to show that the persons in charge of the Bangalore institution acknowledged the authority of the Vanjangadu Matt over it. The ancestors of the present holder of the Matt got possession of the properties in pursuance of a Sannad of and have been in enjoyment thereof for over 150 years. The Matt tried several times to get possession of the building and failed as their claim was totally untenable.

(42) The Bangalore Sri [illegible]

NOTE—Contn. sheet

1797 — 1292

(20

G R. S. 111-2.

General and Revenue Secretariat.

1/102 File No. 369 of 191 9.

Serial No

A Murrai institution where the puja and Mrs services were upheld in 1908 & have been performed regularly. Even now if the services are not performed Sahis get & the Mur deptt can & resume the grants but cannot interfere with the possession of the properties which have been in undisturbed possession of the opponent. Whilst the Vanjangis may desire & get possession of the buildings in question, the matter has to be adjudged in a court of competent Civil Jurisdiction—

Subject to orders

Sd

18/7/14

I have caused a Sketch of the premises in question to be prepared by the Engineering Staff of the Mur Deptt Office and it is part of this record, together with a Note prepared by the draughtsman. The building in

(Cont)

NOTE—Contn sheet

G. R. S. III-2,

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. of 191

Serial No

21

In Gudiem Cantains an Anjaneya Temple known as the Sanketa Anjaneya Temple and also a Brindavanam where Sarveshwara Yogi Maharaja is believed to have been buried in this building. The records clearly show that one Ayyanthi Murti is in possession of the building, including the Temple and the Brindavanam and that these have been in the possession of the members of his family uninterruptedly for over one hundred years.

Sri Raghavendra Swami Mutt at Kumbakonam represents that the building is a branch Mutt belonging to Raghavendra Swami. His case is that one Madhva Rao built the Temple and erected the Brindavanam over a hundred years ago and he built a house for the Archaka to live in and for this institution. When Vasudeva Desikar came to Bangalore, in 1911 -

NOTE—Contd. sheet

G. R. S. III-2

General and Revenue Secretariat

File No. 29 of 191

Serial No

that puja was being performed
pursuant to the persons
notes were not disciples of the
Raghavendra swamy Mutt that
he obtained from Mr Ellis on
the legal duty in question as a gift
and considered it a Mutt and
that he [illegible] removed the
two persons referred to above and
appointed a disciple of the Raghavendra swamy Mutt to perform
puja, and to read puranas and
also put him in possession of
the Inam lands attached to
the office. This took place about
50 years ago. The Mutt also
states that since then Konerachar
and his descendants have been
in possession of the hereditary and
Hereditary service, and that
Ananda Murthi is also in possession
under the Management Trustee of
Raghavendra swamy. He requests
that Ananda Murthi may be removed
and the hereditary and that it may
be delivered to the possession of
the Mutt, as he has resigned his

Konerachar
an ancestor
of Ananda Murthi
who was

NOTE—Contin sheet

G. R. S. III-2

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 21 of 191

Serial No

2

to his duty both to the Municipality of Dharwar & the Govt. Agents treat the building is not a Mutt, that the Mahantaya Swamy Mutt has no right to it and that he and his ancestors have been in enjoyment of it and the Inam lands in their right and rendering service and that the Mamlatdar has no right to interfere the matter being sub judice in the Civil Courts.

The building is in Chuckpet. It is a naked and three sheds and these are in the occupation of tenants who hold them under Agents Mutt. The under signed has been let out. Another Mutt lies in the middle of the South of the temple. It has attached Vajrads rent deeds from the tenants and has also enjoyed the fruit rights of the temple at a rent of Rs. 2. Remarks he is getting a decent rent from the tenants.

The Mamlatdar

And prefer Municipal taxes

NOTE—Contn sheet

G. R. S. III-2)

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 13 1 of 19 1 7

Serial No.

Noted 17th Oct 08

Department is Concerned and with the Anjuman temple which is a Muzrai institution in the Department & there is such Agents in Gadag Kumbal Village, and also a Money Grant of Rs. 27-13-11 the is Yearly conducted here and temple is also in a bad Condition. Consequently there is no reason for interference on the part of the Muzrai department, Officially as the name of the recipient of the Money Grant is given as "Sunnadadavar Anjaneya Mandir Gadag"

Dewan Bahadur Mr. Ramachandra in forwarding this petition of the Gadag Municipality, who is a delegate of Ramachandra Rao Sahib to see the Muzrai Officer can help in the Matter. If there was a Contract between the Mutt and Ramachandra Rao it is for the

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

G. R. S. III-2

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 369 of 1915

Serial No.

[illegible] Dept
Under the Contract, it ought
to decide the case at a Civil Court
[illegible] put [illegible] there a cha-
the [illegible] decision through
[illegible] (or whatever)
and go to [illegible] at once
Case for [illegible] is not
[illegible] from
Outside the Such a suit is not
Civil Courts. [illegible]
[illegible] Alleen holding
[illegible] case it to another and may
[illegible] him if the [illegible] in a Civil
[illegible] Court if the latter should fail
[illegible] to bring [illegible] of the
case is not [illegible] kind.

A { that the [illegible] may be informed
that the interference of the Mysore
Resident

U.S. 5/8/21

A. approves.

Secy
13.8.21

Dept 21/13/8/21

1654-371
12
NOTE—Contn. sheet.

G. R. S. III-2,

General and Revenue Secretariat.

1 Cover File No. 369 of 1919.

Serial No

Rapporteur is invited

24
23/8/21

1434-306.
27.8.21.

Food Member) VJ 23/8/21

Rap approved.

Paul
29.8.21

DEWAN'S OFFICE.
Recd. on AUG 31 1921
Reg. No. 1435

Home
VJ 30/8/21

Home) VJ 31/8/21

Home
12.9.21

May the order issue? As it is an important order, it may be Printed and 100 copies kept in stock for reference & borne as precedent in similar cases.

~~[illegible]~~

BL
14.9.21

VJ 20/9/21

NOTE—Contn sheet

G. R. S. VI—G/32]

SUBJECT..... ....
. ...
....

Diary No. of letter replied to.....

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT,
( )
, the *191*

Section Miscn
File No. 309-17
Serial No. 2

No. G 28 Executive

Date of issue..... 3.1.20

To

Mr Dy. Commr,
Bangalore Dist,

Signed by.....

Sir,

I am directed to forward herewith for detailed early report with reference to petition No. 1186 from Hanigachar, Agent of Sri Raghavendra Swami Mutt at Nanjangud praying for the resumption from the alienee Anantamurti, of the Mutt building at Chikpet

over.

Bangalore, containing the
Temple of Sri Anjaneya Devaru
and the Brindavana of
Sri Raghavendra Swami,
and restoration of the Math,

I have to,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,
Secretary,
Muz. Dept.
23/1/19

List of enclosure

Copied by

Examined by

WD 65—GPD—C0,000—15-11-15

20-21
Mur
369-19
&3
Revd
Revd first
one memo

No. H.C. 565 / 1920

Office of the Deputy Commissioner,
Bangalore District,
Dated Bangalore, 14th December 1920.

From

M.A.Narayana Iyengar, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Deputy Commissioner,
Bangalore District.

To

T.E.Jayarama Iyer, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Secretary to the Government of His Highness
the Maharaja of Mysore, Muzrai Department,
Bangalore.

Sir,

With reference to your No.1928/Muz.369-19-2 dated 3rd January 1920 calling for report with records on the petition of Hariyachar, Agent of the Sri Raghavendra Swami Latt of Nanjungud, I have the honour to submit herewith the entire records connected with the case and to state that the facts thereof are detailed in the enclosed Memorandum.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant.

For Deputy Commissioner,
Bangalore District,
(absent from station)

L.S.R.

From
The Deputy Commissioner
Bangalore

To
The Secretary to
Government

Dated
Despatched 3 / 8 / 20 Dec 20
Received

General No. Ste 565
No. 19 20

Enclosure No. Two files

Submits the
file of records
with a detailed
Report on the petition
Agent of Sri
Swamy Iyer re the
resumption of the
Inam Lands from
the Arasikere ...

MEMORANDUM.

The Agent of the Sri Raghavendra Swami Matt at Nanjan-gud presented a petition to Government complaining that the opponent Anantha Moorthi (the present Archak of the Sri Anjaneya Swami temple in the Sumatheendra Matt at Chickapet, Bangalore City) is incompetent and ineligible to manage the stipulated functions in the temple and the worship therein and that he has been trying to establish his own private rights over the temple building and its adjuncts, posing himself as the owner thereof and prayed for the resumption and restoration of the said building for the benefit of the Sri Anjaneyaswami temple and the Brindavanam of Sri Raghavendraswami consecrated and established therein by a former Swamigalu of the Sumateendraswami or Raghavendraswami Matt. The petition was referred to this office for enquiry and report.

2. On receipt of the petition, it was registered as a case, posted for enquiry and both the parties were given an opportunity to establish their right, title and interest in the institution in question by adducing necessary evidence thereto. They filed several written statements. The parties were represented by their counsel and were duly heard.

The contention of the petitioner is -

(1) that one Madhva Rao of Chickpet in Bangalore City constructed a tank at Doddakunte and got a Kodagi Inam from the Government and endowed it to the Sri Anjareya Devaru installed in his house and arranged for the conduct of Puja and Purana by appointing Thimmanna Bhatta and Gopalachar,

(2) that later on when Sri Varadendra Swami of Sumathe-dra Matt visited the place, Madhva Rao being his disciple made over the trust, the management and all his interest

interest therein as well as in the temple and the endowed property in favour of the said Swamigalu, who accepted the gift and constituted the same as a public Muzrai Institution subordinate to the Sri Raghavendra Swami Matt under its direct control and management,

(3) that as the said Pujari and Puranika (Thimmanna Bhatta and Gopalachar) were not the disciples of Sri Sumatheendra Matt, they were removed from their services and Konerachar, one of the ancestors of the opponent was appoin-ed in their place by Sri Varadendra Swami of Sumatendra or Raghavendra Swami Matt and,

(4) that as the nominee of the said Matt for performing puja, that the opponent's ancestors and opponent have been in occupation of the premises and consequently the opponent was clearly estopped from contesting the title of the Sumatendra Matt and,

(5) that the opponent who for the first time set up a title hostile to that of the Matt, cannot be permitted to any longer continue in possession of the trust properties etc.

4. The opponent's contentions are:-

(1) that the property in question is not a Matt and no part of it belongs to Sri Raghavendra Swami Matt.

(2) that it is his private property in the exclusive possession of himself and his ancestors for over 100 years

(3) that Sri Anjaneya Swami temple is separate in itself and is not in any way connected with the other properties and that he was doing the puja and other work connected with the temple according to 'Mamool',

(4) that the petitioner has not produced any authority to show that he represents the present Matadhipathi of

of the Sri Raghavendra Swami Matt and,

(5) that this is not a Muzrai institution and as such the Muzrai Department has no jurisdiction over the institution.

The records show that the institution is a Muzrai institution receiving an annual ready money grant of Rs.27-14-0 from Government and endowed with Devadaya Inam lands in Dodkunte village, Bangalore Taluk. The petitioner is a general Agent under the General Power of Attorney from the present Head of the Sumatendra or Raghavendra Swami Matt. The facts mentioned in the written statement filed by the petitioner viz. that one Madhva Rao of Chickpet installed Sri Anjaneya Swami in his house, set apart a portion thereof for the Archak's dwelling and endowed some inam lands for the upkeep of the temple were admitted by the opponent's mother Venkoo Bai in her statement before the Amildar on 10th August 1908. She also stated in this statement that the amount derived as rent from the shops were used by her only for the services in the temple and for the temple repairs. Unauthenticated copies of the following documents were also produced by her at the time she gave her statement before the Amildar:-

(1) Decision of the 'Adalat' Court dated 29th October 1811.

(2) A letter from the Swami to Sumatheendra Rajaru.

(3) The order of H.H. the Maharaja and,

(4) The endorsement to the opponent's ancestors.

The opponent himself had admitted the above circumstances in his statement recently recorded on the --

the occasion of the Chitaldrug Murgi Swami's visit to Bangalore and from receipts granted by him to the tenants of the shops attached to the institution in question.

The written arguments adduced by the petitioner's counsel are quite exhaustive and fully bear out the claims put forward on behalf of the Matt regarding its right, title and interest in the institution. The title deeds and other documents in the possession of the petitioner were duly perused and returned for presentation, if necessary, before Government when called upon.

The opponent has not produced any documentary evidence in support of his contention beyond stating that he has been in adverse possession of the properties for over 100 years. From the documents produced by the opponent's mother herself, though they are not attested, it is clear that the properties were really intended for service in the temple.

It is observed that this institution is a purely Muzrai Institution being a temple for the support of which an annual grant in perpetuity is made from the public revenues in addition to a land inam granted and recognized and registered at the Inam Settlement as a Devadaya. It is no doubt under the control of the Matt authorities who have been managing the affairs thereof ever since its existence as per wishes of the original donor who handed over the entire right, title and interest in the institution to the then presiding Swamigalu of the Matt. Besides, it has been ruled by Government so far back as 1873 that the representatives of a temple are not the pujaries or worshippers but the recognized Managers of the institution or the inhabitants of the village in which it is situated. In the present instance, however, it is

amply borne out by the records that such recognized Manager is none other than the presiding Swamigalu of the Sri Sumateendra or Raghavendraswami Matt.

It is apprehended that the opponent who is only a pujari and a nominee of the Matt having no locus standi in the internal management of the affairs of the temple and its adjuncts is intriguing to establish his private rights over the institution and to unauthorizedly alienate portions of the same to suit his own ends. It is further alleged that the opponent is otherwise incompetent and ineligible to manage the stipulated functions in the temple and the worship therein. As per standing orders of Government in the case of temples and other religious and charitable institutions in which the public are interested and which are not the private property of the Managers, even though originally founded by them, failure to keep up the institutions in proper condition would lead to the displacement of the Managers themselves and here the opponent happens to be a mere servant or pujari of the temple liable to be ousted at any time.

The opponent beyond stating that the property in question belonged to his ancestors and was their private property has adduced no documentary evidence thereto nor has he explained as to how he or his ancestors got into the ownership of the institution. He, however, seems to depend entirely upon possession which cannot by itself count in his favour.

The petitioner complains that there has been gross and persistent mismanagement of the institution and of property pertaining thereto and of breach of trust in

in respect thereof and prays for the opponent Archak being ousted and the institution with its adjuncts being taken possession of by Government and delivered back to the Manager thereof, viz. the Swamigalu of the Matt. The petitioner however has not produced evidence of instances in which he or his master exercised authority over the institution. Under the circumstances, I submit herewith the entire records connected with the case together with the written statements filed by the counsels on both sides for such orders as Government may deem fit in the matter.

Sd/- M.A.Narayana Iyengar,

Deputy Commissioner,
Bangalore District.

"C O P Y"

For Deputy Commissioner,
Bangalore District.

G. R. S. 26]

Imperial

File No. 369-19

Serial No. 4

Diary No. of letter replied to .....

No. [illegible]

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

, the 191 .

To

The Imam Sahib,

(via),

Date of issue 19/2/21

Signed by..... for I am directed to say that you would be so good as to forward for records copies of the Imam's reply to the letter from the Government of India, Foreign & Political Department, No. D. 2015 P/21, dated the 18th January 1921, and the letter from the Political Agent, Muscat, dated the 7th February 1921.

over

SUBJECT.

Chikkaballapur Bangalore

I have the

honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient

servant,

8/1/21 - 11-1-21

To

The Secretary,

Inam Commissioner,

Bangalore.

Sir,

I have the honour to request that I may be granted the Inam lands pertaining to the Sri Ramalingeshwara Temple at Bodakurike village, Bangalore taluk, as an Enfranchised Inam for the use of the said Temple.

I am,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

List of enclosures

Copied by

Examined by

GI B—20,000—10 10 14

No. 209 / Rev 2

From

Office of the Superintendent,
Mysore Revenue Survey,
Dated, Bangalore 18th February 1921.



To

K. Darashan, Esq., B.A.,
Superintendent of Revenue Survey and
Inam Settlements in Mysore.

Jayarama Iyer, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Secretary to the Government of H. H.
the Maharaja of Mysore,
Muzrai Department.

Sir,

As requested in para 1 of your letterNo.2521/ Muz.369-19-14, dated 19th January 1921, I have the honor to forward herewith, a copy of the Inam Register pertaining to the grant of cash grants of Rs.7-8-0 and Rs.20-8-0 for the upkeep of Sumatendra Anjaneyaswami at Chikpet, Bangalore.

2. A copy of the Inam Register pertaining to the grant of Inam lands to Sri Anjaneyaswami temple above referred to is also forwarded as requested.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,
S.V. Krishnaswami Ge
Sub Assistant Superintendent,
for Superintendent,
absent from station.

ISR.

Register Sheet No. ...

Taluk. ...

Hobli. ...

Village. ...

General No.	Value of the Inam	Description of Inams If for service, it is to be stated whether it is performed If for buildings, tanks, etc, whether they are efficiently kept up	Heredi ure. unconditional for only, or of two or more lives.
1	2	3	
8	R. A. P 1 - 11 - 1 a month or 20 - 6 - 2 a year	Devadaya	for E huje of -thara of - hudra in the Rajh Sirami the Chikpet Bangalore In good order of Service
17	R. A. P 0 - 10 - 0 a month = 7 - 8 - 0 a year	- Do -	for daily mangal arthi to Sumatendra Thirtha of Bangalore Chikpet Service performed

[illegible] the Village of

in the

When, and by whom, and to whom granted	Name of the party registered in the Standard Muṛai or other recognized accounts
5	6
Granted by D. Poomiah in 1800	H. Lavajami Pathi 1828. Sumatendra Arjunaya K.K.P P.2.6 7-0-0 a year
one original Nirup dated 1799-1800 granting the Sum of 12 Pags a year to Hanumantha-lavari founded by D vendra Sa-	Barand 1875 Sanad No 1-11-1.
Unknown	Faisalabi Jama Varch 1847. Chikpet Arjunaya. 360 Pags a year. Barand 1875 Pay in Bill in Cl 10

Taluk of Banga

DESCRIPTIVE ROLL OF THE PRESENT RECIPIENT

Name, place of residence, and age	Caste or tribe, height and complexion	Indelible marks tending to identification of the
7	8	9
Bangalore Chikpet Sumatendra Anjaneya Pradhan		
[illegible] Bangalore Sumatendra Anjaneya [illegible] Pradhan		

Bangalore of the Division

Relationship to the rantee or the registered holder	Particulars of the heirs of the party in Col. 7	PARTICULARS OF THE COMMUTED LAND			
		Village and Taluk	Description and No.	Extent	Assessment
10	11	12	13	14	15
—	—	—	—	—	—

Recommendation of the Assistant	Review by the Special Assistant and confd by the Inam Commissioner
16	17
1. Valid under Rule I 2. The monthly payments vary a little. But the annual grant is 7 Pags. (= Rs 20-5-11). 3 To be confirmed, so long as the institution is in good order & the Sc is not in existence. Rs 20-6-0 a year. 4. Commutation declined (Sd) D.N. Narasimhaiyer Asstt: 10.1.76	1. Payment of Rs twenty and annas Six per annum confirmed (Sd) R. A. Cole Superintendent 28.2.76.
See Remarks in case No 3. This is also another pagoda in ruins. 2. To be Confirmed and continues so long as the Services are performed and the institution is in good order. Rs 7-8-0 a year	1. Payment of Rs Seven and annas eight per annum Confirmed. (Sd) R. A. Cole Superintendent 28.2.76.

GPB—100—9.8.06

Col: 16 Contd

3. Commutation — declined.

4. This institution is identical with that in Case 8.

(Sd) Q. N. Narasimhaya
Assistant

* This is a grant-in-aid allowance on the Sayer revenue. In 1847, the Superintendent commuted into a payment from the treasury. vide Stat. Com No 30 dated 2-3-7.

For S. Krishnaswami Iyer

Register sheet No. 301

Taluk Bangalore

~~Sammat~~

Village Kodagu Registers of Halasuru Sammath

Copy of the Register of Inams in the village of Dod Kenchi in Kodagi

CLASS, EXTENT AND VALUE OF INAM

Number of case or entire holding under one grant in this village	General class to which the Inam belongs	Survey No and name of field or fields comprised in the grant Dry, wet or garden	Extent	
			Local measure. Even where the local measure is in acres, guntas and annas, it is to be entered in this column	Measure in acres and their fractions in decimals
1	2	3	4	5
	Kodagi	Proportionate As per Amani account 1808		
		Dry	0 - 16 - 15¼	
		Wet	2 - 16 - 4	
			3 - 13 - 3¼	

Sámmat of Halasoor 2

in the Taluk of Bangalore

Old assessment	Survey assessment	DESCRIPTION, TENURE AND Description of Inam If for service, it is to be stated whether the service is continued If for tanks, buildings, etc., whether they are efficiently kept up Hereditary or for life	Whether free of tax, etc, or liable to quit-rent, i. e. jodi, etc., amount of latter to be entered
Where no survey has been made and no assessment fixed by Government, the cess paid by the raiyats to the Inamdar, or the average assessment of similar Government land, should be entered in column 7			
6	7	8	9
Proportionate Cess on that in the Jamabandi account 1808 D. 6-7-4 = 19-9-6 W. 7-0-2 = 20-6-6 13-7-6 = 39-15-6	—	For the upkeep of the Kodagi tank of the village Not in good order	Free

in the District

DOCUMENT IN SUPPORT OF THE INAM

By whom granted and in what year	Written instruments in support of the claim, original sannad, all miscellaneous documents, and other proofs of long possession In this column it should be stated whether the Inam is held with or without grant, whether the grant is produced or lost, etc., and the general specification of terms of all documents produced should be given.
10	11

of

NAME AND RELATIONSHIP OF ORIGINAL GRANTEE AND

Name of original grantee	Name entered in the register prepared by Purniah up to 1810	Name entered in the accounts subsequent to 1810
12	13	14
—	Huzur Jam account 1808 Dodkunte tank Achkat 29-13-1/4 — Inam Dry 0-17-2¼ 6-8-0 wet 3-4-2 8-0-0 4-1-2¼ 14-8-0 1. Pandu Rangachara Srinivasachar 2. Venkatabhat 3. Gundachar 4. Gopalachar Tq. Pynaishi 1807 Extent as above	Huzur Jami acct. 1831 Tank in ruins Enjoyed by Srinivasa-char & Anantachar on behalf of the Kadaqidar Achkat 21-8-4¾ Inam Dry 0-12-12¾ 6-8-0 wet 2-11-3¼ 8-0-0 3-4-0 14-8-0 Tq. Kodigi Nagar 1828- Dodkunte Tank Figures as above

OF SUBSEQUENT AND PRESENT HOLDERS

Particulars regarding present owner. If the inam has been subdivided, the name, etc., of each sharer should be entered in the columns			
Residence, name and age, etc.	Relation to original grantee or subsequent registered holders	Surviving heirs of the present incumbent	If unconnected with the original holders, possession how obtained, and in what year
15	16	17	18
Bangalore			
1. Ramachar 60 $\frac{1}{2}$	Son of No 1 as in col 13	Son	$\frac{1}{4}$ Hereditary $\frac{1}{4}$ was not in 1824 by the heir of No 3 as in col 11 No deed
2. Venu Bai 30 $\frac{1}{4}$	Sons widows of Ramachar as in col 11		
3. Nagu Bai 45 $\frac{1}{4}$			

LENGTH OF POSSESSION	
Abstract of the orders already issued by the Commissioner or the Superintendent of the Division on lapses regarding validity or excess of the Inam. Assistant's opinion and recommendation	Review by the Special Assistant and confirmation by the Inam Commissioner
1	20

1. Valid under Rule I. Whole grant excluded from the Kayam gutta.
2. According to the Jain accounts the tank was built by one Madhva Rao who obtained the Inam and made a gift of it to the parties in col: 13 The Condition of the up-keep of the tank rests on the Kodagidars. The inam therefore falls under Clause B as defined by Recs 8.
3. The Achkat is given in cols 13 + 14.
4. The mortgage is more than 30 years old. The usual notice is ~~given~~ issued under clause II of Precis 16. The enjoyment of the mortgagee is mentioned in the accounts of 1831.
5. The tank is in ruins. It was so before 1831, vide Jain account of 1831 + Amildars Regr. II
6. The Shares of Nos 2 and 3 are alloted subject to the condition of performing puja to Hanumantha devar of Raghavendra Swami's Math and reciting Puranas in the matt The widows perform the Service by Proxy as the Maharaja's Firman dated 1811 Confirming the award of the Huzur Adalat Court. vide also Judicial Commr's decree in A.S 4 No 17 dated 1868 Confirming the Decree of the Bangalore Amildar in O.S. No 264 of 1866.
7. No recommendation is made regarding quit rent

pending Trial orders.

19 1. 1876.

(Sd) W. N. Nanayakkara
Asst

P. S.

The extent is as stated as the West Part of the land was taken up for a road in Cantonement and no Substitute granted vide Deputy Commrs order No 9 of 6.4.187

		K. K. P.	
Land taken up	Dry	0 — 0 — 3	The asstt is as incorporated in col. 6
	Wet	0 - 7 - 14	
		0 - 8 - 1	

19 1. 1876.

(Sd) W. N. N
Asst

Review by the Special Assistant and Confirmation by the Inam Commissioner

20

1 As the Tank has been in ruins since before 1831, and the Kodagidars have utterly failed in discharging their duties for so many years, I do not consider that this case can come within the scope of the recent orders. The Inam is resumed.

(Sd) R. D. Cole
Superintendent of Inam - attached

22.5.1876

2. Send for the Guttadar's Sannad and for the Late Maharaja's Nirup of 1811 quoted in Para 6 of Col. 19. Order of resumption to be kept in abeyance.

(Sd) R. D. Cole
Supdt

8.7.76

3. Read decree of the Huzur Adawlat Court of 1811 and the Maharaja's Nirup - under which the 1/2 Share of Rs 2 + 3 to be Continued as Devadaya a Inam and the 1/2 Share of Rs 1 to be resumed, as the Tank has been in ruins since before 1831.

22.3.77

(Sd) R. D. Cole
Supdt

4. Vide the Devasthana Proc No 5268- 2 dated
of the 24th November 82 authorising the Inam
Superintendent to confirm the Share of
Rs1 to the Anjaneya Temple of the
Uttaradi Mutt at Bangalore as Deva-
-dayam in the same manner as the
remaining half was confirmed to the other
Mutt.

5. The resumption of the Share in question
is therefore Cancelled and the same
Confirmed to the said Pagoda free of
tax, so long as the object of the grant
is duly fulfilled.

(Sd) J. P. Grant
Superintendent.

2. 12. 1882

---

6. vide Govt. General & Rev. Secretary's
letter No R. 2418/LR 306-4-2 dated 3rd
October 1914 forwarding Copy of letter
No: 3593 dated 26th August 1914 from the
Collector, Civil & Military Station,
Bangalore directing that ~~1g.~~ 10 acres.
and 34 guntas out of this Inam be
acquired for the Castle Huidru Extension
in Wheeler Road and granting an

Col 20 Continued.

an equal extent as Inam out of the lands of the Kayanigutta village.

(Sd). D. K. Daraskar.
Superintendent

16.10.1914

Copy
S. V. Krishnaswamy Iyer
for Superintendent
Mysore Rev Survey

Proceedings of the Govt. of H.H.
the Maharaja of Mysore.

Read:--

Petition registered No. 1136, dated 23rd December 1919, presented by Hariachar, Agent of the Sree Raghavendraswami Matt at Nanjangud, praying for the resumption-from one Anantnamurthi of the Sumatendra Matt building at Chikpet, Bangalore City, containing the Sri Anjaneyaswami temple.

2. Letter No. H.C.565/1920 dated 14th December 1920 from the Deputy Commissioner, Bangalore District, submitting a report with connected papers.

Order No. 1579-20
Judicial 369-19-6

Dated, Bangalore, ~~31st August~~ 28th Septr 1921.

The building in question contains an Anjaneva temple known as Sumatendra Anjaneya temple and also, a Brindavanam where sacred earth brought from Manthralaya is said to have been worshipped, but no remains of any of the Swamies of the Sri Raghavendraswami Matt have been buried therein.

2 The agent of the Sri Raghavendraswami Mutt at Nanjangud contends that the building is a branch mutt belonging to Sree Raghavendra Swami Mutt. He represents that one Madhu Rao built the temple and erected the Brindavanam over one hundred years ago and also constructed a house for the archak to live in and that some inam was secured for this institution,

that when Sri Varadendraswami of the Sri Raghavendraswami Matt visited -- Bangalore, he obtained from Madhu Rao the building in question as a gift and constituted it as a Mutt, that he removed two persons who were performing puja etc., in the temple as they were not his disciples and appointed one Koneriachar, a disciple of the Mutt, to perform puja and to read Purana, that since then Koneriachar and his decendants have been in possession of the building and rendering service, and that Anantha Murthi, a Shishya of Koneriachar is in possession under the arrangement then made by Sri Varadendraswami. On the ground that the said Ananthamurthi has set up his own title to the building, adversely to the Mutt, he requests that he may be ousted from the building and that it may be delivered to the possession of the Mutt. Ananthamurthi, on the other hand, contends that the building is not a Mutt, that the Sri Raghavendraswami has no right to it and that he and his ancestors have been in the enjoyment of it and the cash and Inam endowments in their own -- right and rendering service therein.

3. The records before Government clearly show that Ananthamurthi is in possession of the entire building, including the temple and the *Brindavanam*, and that these have been in the possession of the members of his family uninterruptedly for over one hundred years.

4. The Muzrai Department is concerned

concerned only with the Anjaneya temple, which is a Muzrai institution in the enjoyment of some dry and wet lands in Doddakunte village and also a cash grant of Rs. 27-13-11 per annum. The recipient of the cash grant is shown in the Inam register as Sumatendra Anjaneya manager protem. The temple is in a good condition and puja service is reported to be properly conducted in it. In these circumstances Government in the Muzrai Department see no reason to interfere in the matter. The Deputy Commissioner is requested to inform the petitioner accordingly.

(Fair draft). 23/8/24

Secretary to Government,
Muzrai Department.

23/8/24

To

The Deputy Commissioner, Bangalore District, returning the records.

29.8.24

The Muzrai Superintendent in Mysore.

- - - - - - -

Report to accompany the plan of

Sri "Sumukendria Anjaneya temple premises" in Chickpet.

The building is situated on the side of the Chickpet Road facing the South. The whole area of the site is 60½ x 80'. The front portions except the main entrance are divided into rooms and let out. The portion on the east of the main entrance (shop 85 + 86) is a terraced building measuring 28' x 35'. Both the ground + first floor are let out. The cost of this portion of the building may come about Rs 12,000. The main entrance to the temple to an area of 15' x 10' is also terraced with Staircase etc complete. It may cost about Rs 1,500. The portion west of the main entrance has been divided into two rooms of 13' x 17½' and 7½ x 17½', and used as 'Mithayi' shop and betle leaves & shop respectively.

All the portions except the main entrance + shop no 85 + 86, are of tiled roof. The deity of Anjaneya and the stone 'Brundavanam' are placed side by side in a garbha gruha of 10½' x 6½' (outer dimensions). A space of 2½ feet around the three sides of the garbha gruha (outer prakara) is left for pradakshina purpose, except the front portion which is 9½' x 10½ feet. The temple proper is in which there is a Tulasi Brundavana, and a bilva stand. In front of the main temple there is an open verandah.

The portion on the east of the main temple is partly open + partly dismantled. The portion west of the main temple is occupied by Mr Ananta Murthy Rao who is called himself the owner of the house. The portions behind the temple are let out.

Puja is carried out to the deity of Anjaneya & and the Samputa kept over the stone Brundavanam on every day — . — — — —

3/8/21.

F. 21. 2. 21

With compliments to the Secretary to Govt. The Submission BA Rec 21. 21 papers may be expedited.

LORE,
8th February 1921.

P. Raghavendra Rao, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Member of Council,
Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,
Bangalore.

Respected Sir,

I most humbly beg leave to approach your honour with the following representation and pray for an early redress in the matter.

My petition to Government in the matter of the resumption of the Sri SumatendraSwami or RaghavendraSwami Matt building at Chickpet Bangalore City, containing the temple of Sri Anjaneya Devaru and the Brindavana of Sri Raghavendraswami and the restoration thereof to the Matt authorities is pending since January 1920. The matter was referred to the Deputy Commissioner, Bangalore, for enquiry and report. The Deputy Commissioner after enquiring into the case forwarded his report to Government in December last. These two months the report with connected papers is pending before Government and I humbly pray that the connected records may be kindly perused and orders passed at an early date. The presiding Swamigalu of the Matt is very anxiously awaiting the disposal of this case for over a year with the hope of arranging for the proper conduct of worship etc., in the temple and Brindavanam and has consequently been enjoining on the petitioner to put forth the real grievances before Government and seek for redress, at an early date. Further the stipulated functions in the said Institution are completely neglected and the temple and adjoining premises are polluted to a very great extent by all sorts of persons and the same is being used as a gambling den.

I, therefore, solicit the favour of very early orders in this connection.

I beg to remain,
Honoured Sir,
Your most obedient servant.

[illegible]

Agent of Sri Raghavendraswami Matt

BANGALORE,

18th February 1921.

To

P.Raghavendra Rao, Esq., B.A., B.L.,

Member of Council,

Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore

Bangalore.

Respected Sir,

I most humbly beg leave to approach your honour with the following representation and pray for an early redress in the matter.

My petition to Government in the matter of the resumption of the Sri SumatendraSwami or RaghavendraSwami Matt building at Chickpet Bangalore City, containing the temple of Sri Anjaneya Devaru and the Brindavana of Sri Raghavendraswami and the restoration thereof to the Matt authorities is pending since January 1920. The matter was referred to the Deputy Commissioner, Bangalore, for enquiry and report. The Deputy Commissioner after enquiring into the case forwarded his report to Government in December last. These two months the report with connected papers is pending before Government and I humbly be that the connected records may be kindly perused and orders passed at an early date. The presiding Swamigalu of the Matt is very anxiously awaiting the disposal of this case for over a year with the hope of arranging for the proper conduct of worship etc., in the temple and Brindavanam and has consequently been enjoining on the petitioner to put forth the real grievances before Government and seek for redress, at an early date. Further the stipulated functions in the said Institution are completely neglected and the tem and adjoining premises are polluted to a very great extent by all sorts of persons and the same is being used as a gambling den.

I, therefore, solicit the favour of very early orders in this connection.

I beg to remain,
Honoured Sir,
Your most obedient servant.

Sd/- Hariachar,

for Sri Raghavendra

Copy of the above is submitted to the Secretary to Governme
Muzrai Department, for favour of perusal and early orders.

दुर्गा-पाय.

Agent of Sri Raghavendraswami Mat
of Nanjangud.

Decay No 1057
19-9-21

Presented in person with an advance Rs 3/-
BG 1794

Before The Government of His Highness
The Maharaja of Mysore
Bangalore
Muzrai Department.

Muz. Appeal of CKm.

Petitioner:- Hariya Char S.L.C.

Opponent:- Anantmurthy

Copy Application.

The opponent above named prays for a copy of the final order passed by The Government of His Highness in The Muzrai department in The above matter

The copy, application for which is in the file M. 2261-19.
Clerk
Has been granted
The copy is sent
for kind signature
BG
21/9/21

H. Venkata Rao
Advocate for the Opp.t.

Bangalore
17.9.21

S. Chandramata Rao.
Opponent.

Copy of the [illegible]

[illegible]

Sd Chandramata Rao

Dag.

Serial No. 2485

1920-21
SECTION Mar
FILE No. /
SERIAL No. 6

Court of the Mysore secretary
Bangalore.

Recd 6/6/21

Mug. Rch.ⁿ

Petitioner:- Government.

Hiriya Bhar vs Ananta murthi.

List of Documents produced before the Mysore secretary to the Government in connection to the Notice No. 4166 Mug:69-11 dated 30-5-1921 -

Serial No.	Date	Description of Document.
1	5-9-1874	[illegible]
2.	1-6-1[illegible]1	[illegible]
3.	15-6-1911	[illegible]

No.		Description Document.
4.		Fifty-five kandayam receipts for 1900-1901 to 1919-1920.
5.	22-6-1916	License of House construction granted by Municipality to Venkubayamma (Mother of the Opponent)
6.	1-1-1908	Rental deed executed by M. Srinivasa ryngar in favour of Venkamma.
7.	11-12-07	Notice by the Agent of Raghavendraswamy Mutt to the Opponents Mother Venkamma
8.	13-12-07	Notice by the Swamy of Raghavendraswamy

Mutt to Venkubayamma.

Bangalore
6th June 1921

S.S. ~~Opponent~~ & L.C.
S.S. Ananthamurthi & Co
Opponent.

The other documents relating to title of the opponent have been handed over to Haji Zecheria Haji Hasham Saist No. 141, Commercial Street & M. Station, Bangalore. who is the mortgagee with possession of premises No. 85, 86/1, 87/1 situated in the Taluk Kutchery Road Bangalore city under three Registered mortgage deeds.

Bangalore
6th June 1921

E.S. Ananthamurthi
opponent.

Received back all the documents mentioned in this petn.

21.9.21
Bangalore

Diary No. 1058
17-9-21

Presented in person:
Bly 17-9-21

ONE ANNA STAMP

Before the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore
Bangalore
Muzrai Department.

Muzrai of

Petitioner:- Hariya Char

Opponent:- Anantmurthy

The opponent above named prays for a return of the documents filed by him in the Muzrai secretariat in the above matter on or about 6th June 1921.

Bangalore
17.9.21.

T. S. Ananthamurthi Rao.
Opponent

Copy of the Order
Bly 21-9-21